

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following comments.

Claims 1-33 are currently pending. Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been inserted. Support for the amendment of claims 1, 10, and 19 can be found in the specification at least at page 7, lines 9-19.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants thank Examiner for conducting an interview on December 14, 2004. During the interview, the outstanding rejections were discussed. Applicants asserted that Hinrichs et al. in view of Kenney et al. do not teach or suggest the invention of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants argued that Hinrichs does not disclose that the remote site has the ability to change programming on a real time basis. The Examiner provisionally agreed with this position but suggested that the claims be amended to more clearly distinguish Hinrichs.

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hinrichs et al. (USPN 4,515,545) in view of Kenney et al. (USPN 6,445,969). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Hinrichs discloses a control system for processing composite material. Hinrichs states that "the hereinafter described calculation and comparisons are performed in accordance with a process control algorithm." See col. 9, lines 48-52 (emphasis added). However, Hinrichs does not disclose or suggest that the algorithm can be changed, much less remotely on a real time basis. Accordingly, Hinrichs does not teach or suggest that a "remote site has the ability to change programming of the programmable logic controller on a real time basis" as required by claims 1, 10, and 19.

Kenney fails to cure the deficiencies of Hinrichs. Kenney discloses a statistical process control integration system for use in the manufacture of printed circuit boards. However, Kenney does not teach or suggest that a "remote site has the ability to change programming of the programmable logic controller on a real time basis" as required by claims 1, 10, and 19. Therefore, the combination of Hinrichs and Kenney fails to teach or suggest the invention of

claims 1, 10, or 19. As claims 2-9 and 28-29 are dependent on claim 1, claims 11-18 and 30-31 are dependent on claim 10, and claims 20-27 and 32-33 are dependent on claim 19, they are also not taught or suggested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

20 Dec 2004
Date

Mark DiPietro
Mark DiPietro
Reg. No. 28,707
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: (612) 371-5375
E-mail: mdipietro@merchant-gould.com



MD:MED:kf